

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2008. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 13-20 and 51 are pending in this application, with claim 13 being the independent claim. Claims 1-12 and 21-50 have been canceled.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The indication that claim 50 contains allowable subject matter is gratefully noted. Claim 13 has been amended with the features of claim 50. As such, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 14, 17-20 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,621,451 to Fisher et al. ("Fisher") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Michail et al. ("Michail"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,335,319 to Obata ("Obata"), and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,881 to Ikedo ("Ikedo"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the present amendments.

Claim 13 has been amended with the elements of allowable claim 50 and specifically recites "wherein a final trapezoid required to complete the arc is a fraction of the full trapezoids, and wherein standard texture is used for the final trapezoid and wherein adjusted perspective texture coordinates are used to draw a final segment without distortion." The Examiner acknowledges that the cited prior art does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, claim 13 distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claims 14, 17-20, and 51 depend on claim 13 and distinguish over the cited references at least for that reason.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Obata, Ikedo, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,000 to Richens ("Richens"). Richens fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed

above, and claim 15 distinguishes over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Obata, Ikedo, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Mukoyama et al. (“Mukoyama”). Mukoyama fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 16 distinguishes over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher, Michail, Ikedo, Obata, and further in view of “Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice, Second Edition” by Foley (“Foley”). Foley fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 18 and 19 distinguish over the cited references at least for depending on claim 13.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: July 30, 2008

By: /CHAD C. ANDERSON, REG. NO. 44505/  
Chad C. Anderson  
Reg. No. 44,505  
(480) 385-5060